

PTO/SB/21 (08-03)

Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>		Application Number 09/657,497
		Filing Date 09/08/2000
		First Named Inventor John Selby Unite
		Art Unit 3826
		Examiner Name Robert W. Morgan
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 25	Attorney Docket Number JP920000171US1	

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 11 2004

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Remarks</div>	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Anthony V. S. England
Signature	
Date	10/10/2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name	Anthony V. S. England
Signature	
	Date 10/10/2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PTO/SB/17 (10-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

 Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$ 330.00)

Complete If Known

Application Number	09/657,497
Filing Date	09/08/2000
First Named Inventor	John Selby Unite
Examiner Name	Robert W. Morgan
Art Unit	3626
Attorney Docket No.	JP920000171US1

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

 Check Credit card Money Order Other None
 Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number

International Business Ma
Deposit Account Name

The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply)

Charge fee(s) indicated below Credit any overpayments
 Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s)
 Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Small Entity

Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051 130	2051 65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052 50	2052 25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053 130	1053 130	Non-English specification	
1812 2,520	1812 2,520	For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	
1804 920*	1804 920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805 1,840*	1805 1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251 110	2251 55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252 420	2252 210	Extension for reply within second month	
1253 950	2253 475	Extension for reply within third month	
1254 1,480	2254 740	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255 2,010	2255 1,005	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401 330	2401 165	Notice of Appeal	
1402 330	2402 165	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	\$330.00
1403 280	2403 145	Request for oral hearing	
1451 1,510	1451 1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452 110	2452 55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453 1,330	2453 665	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501 1,330	2501 665	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502 480	2502 240	Design issue fee	
1503 640	2503 320	Plant issue fee	
1460 130	1460 130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807 50	1807 50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806 180	1806 180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021 40	8021 40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809 770	2809 385	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1810 770	2810 385	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801 770	2801 385	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1802 900	1802 900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) (\$ 330.00)

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

		Fee from below	Fee Paid
Total Claims		-20* =	X =
Independent Claims		-3** =	X =
Multiple Dependent			

Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Description
Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	
1202 18	2202 9	Claims in excess of 20
1201 86	2201 43	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203 290	2203 145	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204 86	2204 43	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1206 18	2206 9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) (\$ 0)

** or number previously paid, if greater. For Reissues, see above

SUBMITTED BY	Anthony V.S. England	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	35,129	Telephone	512-477-7165
Name (Print/Type)	Signature		Date	10/10/2004	

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 11 2004

In re the application of: Unite)
)
 Filed: September 8, 2000) Group Art Unit: 3626
)
 For: Build and Operate Program) Examiner: Robert W. Morgan
 Process Framework and)
 Execution)
)
 Appl. No.: 09/657,497)
)
 Appellant's Docket:)
 JP920000171US1)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The assignee, International Business Machines Corporation, is the real party in interest.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

This is the first appeal in the present patent application. There are no other appeals or interferences known to the appellant or its legal representative. International Business Machines Corporation is the sole assignee of the patent application.

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 21-25 are pending in the application. All claims stand finally rejected and are the subject of this appeal.

Claims 1 through 28 were originally presented in the application. In response to a first Office action (the "First Office Action"), dated November 13, 2003, which rejected all claims on the grounds of prior art, Appellant filed a reply ("Reply A") on February 13, 2004, amending claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, and 25 and canceling claims 3, 7, 12, 17, 20, and 26-28.

The First Office Action also rejected claims 1-28 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Appellant regards as the invention. The 112 rejections were withdrawn by the Examiner based on the changes made by Appellant to the claims in Reply A.

An Office Action (the "Final Office Action"), dated May 5, 2004, finally rejected all pending claims in the present case. Specifically, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18, 24, and 25 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge" by William R. Duncan (Duncan) in view of U.S. Patent 6,032,124 (Saito). Claims 6, 9, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, and 23 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan in view of U.S. Patent 6,381,610 (Gundewar). Claim 8 stands finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan and Gundewar in view of Saito.

The Final Office Action also rejected claims all pending claims under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter.

Appellant has appealed from the final rejection. Notice of Appeal, received by the USPTO on August 9, 2004.

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP92000017IUS1

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed subsequent to those submitted in Reply A. The claims in the Claim Appendix herein set out the claims as amended in Reply A.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present invention is claimed in the form of a system in independent claims 1 and 6 and a method in independent claims 10, 15, 21, 22, and 24, respectively.

The system of claim 1 concerns a build and operate program that includes “information technology.” This term is used in the claims as a convenient way of referring to systems including computer systems or telecommunications equipment or a combination thereof, including both hardware and software, and is a well-understood term. See, e.g., www.foldoc.org definition for “Information Technology” (“Applied computer systems - both hardware and software, and often including networking and telecommunications, usually in the context of a business or other enterprise.”) Support for this language is found throughout the specification. See, e.g., page 1, line 27-page 2, line 2 (“A further example of a program is providing technology . . . The program involves building and operating the Olympic Games technology . . . Component projects can, for example, relate to building and operating information technology infrastructure, computer application systems, and telecommunications systems . . . and defining the processes for the collection and dissemination of results information . . .”); page 2, line 30-page 3, line 1 (“An example of a process methodology is the Capability Maturity Model (CMM) . . . The focus of CMM is the build phase of software engineering projects.”); page 12, line 20-page 13, line 2 (“To place the size of the program . . . in perspective . . . In terms of computing and telecommunications resources, 80 IBM MQ series servers and 3 IBM S/390 mainframes are deployed. Additionally, there will be 17,000 desktop and portable computing devices in use, as well as numerous other peripheral devices such as printers, validators and displays. An estimated 13 million lines of program code was written to implement all the necessary applications.”); page 38, lines 1 and 2 (“Once the . . . framework has been established, it is traversed to execute the program.”).

The system, as claimed, includes one or more build processes 20-26, one or more operate processes 30-36, and one or more management processes 40-44. Present application,

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

FIG's 1-4; page 8, lines 4-9; page 9, lines 10-17, line 30; page 10, line 1. According to the claim, the information technology includes data representing inputs and outputs for processes and a plurality of links 50, 60 70, 80, 90, 100 and 28, 38, and 48 and 110-116, 120-124, 130-134 and 140-144, 150 and 170 that provide connections linking outputs from the build, operate and management processes to inputs of respective other build, operate or management processes. FIG's 1-4; page 8, lines 13-31, page 9, lines 1-5, lines 10-28. The links have exit conditions 162-166 and 182 associated with them that must be satisfied before the link can be traversed from output to input. FIG. 4; page 10, lines 4-12. Selected sets of sequentially-linked processes are assigned to selected project teams, and the sets are designated as respective process streams (Workforce/training, Process, Testing/SW Control & Distribution, Venues/Infrastructure/Device Configuration & Logistics/Operations, Application Development). FIG. 8; Page 38, lines 12-27. Planning milestones m1-m20 are designated for the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams. FIG. 8; Page 12, lines 5-10, Page 38, lines 7-10, 12-15, 27-28.

The system of claim 6 more specifically concerns a system for a large-scale sporting event. According to the claim, the information technology for the event includes, a set of build processes 20 followed by a set of testing processes 22, operations processes 30 and 32, and game-day processes 34. FIG. 6; Page 13, lines 3-6. The system of claim 6 also includes a set of management processes 40 and 42 related to all of the build, testing, operations, and game-day sets of processes. FIG. 6, page 13, lines 7-10. The event information technology includes data representing inputs and outputs for processes and a plurality of links (Entry Criteria and Exit Criteria). FIG. 9, Page 13, lines 9-11, page 14, line 30, page 15, line 1. Similar to claim 1, the links provide connections linking outputs from build, test, operate, game-day, and management processes to inputs of respective other build, test, operate, game-day, and management processes. FIG. 1; page 8, lines 13-14, lines 17-31. The remainder of claim 6 is like claim 1.

Claim 10 has language similar to claim 1 but is in method form.

Claim 15 is a method form of claim 1 but includes the step of executing the program, including traversing the links from their respective outputs to their respective inputs, wherein

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

a respective one of the links 150 or 170 is traversed only if the link's exit conditions 162 -166 or 166 and 182 are satisfied. FIG. 4; page 10, lines 1-12.

Claim 21 has language similar to claim 6 but is in method form.

Claim 22 is a method form like claim 15 but includes the step of determining program requirements 205. FIG. 5A, Page 10, lines 20-22.

Claim 24 is a method form like claim 22 but has an additional step regarding executing the program and has additional limitations regarding repeating of steps. Page 38, lines 1-2; page 6, lines 15-20.

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge" by William R. Duncan (Duncan) in view of U.S. Patent 6,032,124 (Saito) and of U.S. Patent 6,381,610 (Gundewar).

Claims 6, 9, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan in view of U.S. Patent 6,381,610 (Gundewar).

ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 stand or fall together.

Claim 1, Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, on grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper. The Examiner pointed out in the First Office Action that the claims describe an invention that *does* meet the test for statutory subject matter with regard to producing a useful, concrete and tangible result, but not with regard to being within the technological arts. First Office Action, page 17 ("Although the recited process produces a useful, concrete and tangible result . . . the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts . . ."). However, the claims were rejected on grounds that "These steps and means do not apply, involve, use or advance

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

the technological arts since they can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. These steps and means only constitute an idea of how to define, [link], and [traverse] processes." First Office Action, pages 16-17.

In response, independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 21, 22, 24 and 26 were amended in Reply A amended to particularly point out aspects of the invention within the technological arts in order to meet the test for statutory subject matter and thereby overcome the rejection. However, the rejections were maintained. Final Office Action, pages 16-17.

Appellant respectfully contends claim 1 states an invention in the technological arts. In particular, claim 1 now states that a system for a build and operate program comprises information technology for executing the build and operate program and data structures for processing by the information technology. Reply A specifically pointed out that the term "information technology" in the claim refers to systems including computer systems or telecommunications equipment or a combination thereof, including both hardware and software. And this is a well-understood term in the field of computing technology, as explained in Reply A and in the Summary of Claimed Subject Matter herein above. Thus, the system of claim 1 includes computer systems or telecommunications equipment, or a combination thereof, including both hardware and software.

As the First Office Action acknowledged, the claimed system produces a useful, concrete and tangible result. Appellant contends the claimed systems are not merely an idea of how to define, link, and traverse processes that is performed in the mind of a user or by use of a pencil and paper. Instead, the claimed systems are tangible machines having a particular structure. That is, the claimed system, which is a machine, as explained immediately above, also includes data having a specific structure set out in the claim. A machine having an identified structure in terms of its hardware and software combination is a statutory machine. See MPEP 2106 IV B 2 (a) (discussing statutory machines and *In re Lowry*, 32 F3d 1579, 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1994)). The claimed computer systems or telecommunications equipment, including both hardware and software, not only produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, but also is a tangible machine having particularly pointed out structures in which included data has inputs, outputs, links and exit conditions. As such, the claimed system is a

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

statutory machine. For these reasons, Appellant respectfully contends the independent system claim 1 is within the scope of 35 USC 101.

Claim 1, Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 1 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge" by William R. Duncan (Duncan) in view of U.S. Patent 6,032,124 (Saito) and of U.S. Patent 6,381,610 (Gundewar). Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper because i) it does not explain the pertinence of the specific parts of each reference relied upon for rejection of each specific element or step, ii) all the limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by the cited art, and iii) it is improper to combine the teachings of the references that are relied upon for the rejection of claim 1.

According to the present application:

"Once the program framework has been established, it is traversed to execute the program. An essential function of program management is Schedule Control. When all outputs have been defined, process owners are required to *translate process outputs into a time schedule*. In this way *time dependencies of the completion of each process can be identified*. The use of task activity charts, and the like, is well known, however, *the present invention takes the approach of identifying a subset of all task activities (specifically those that equate to the output of each process) and allocating milestones to process outputs that cut-across defined process streams*. For Schedule control within a project, an activity in the project Schedule is only completed when it satisfies the pre-defined exit criteria. For Schedule control across projects, *milestones* are used. Milestones are groups of outputs produced by a Project Team, that are inputs to processes owned by other Project Teams. Milestones then represent the key dependencies between Project Teams, and are the primary Schedule control tool at a program level.

Consider again Fig. 8, which identifies the following *process streams*:

- (i) Workforce/training
- (ii) Process
- (iii) Testing/SW Control & Distribution
- (iv) Venues/Infrastructure/Device Configuration &
- Logistics/Operations
- (v) Application Development

Process streams are a string of processes typically assigned to a single Project Team. *Where there is a link spanning one or more process streams, a milestone is defined* to represent a dependency between Project Teams. Fig. 8 shows such milestones, indicated as Mn.

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP9200000171US1

The activities and milestones can be entered into a suitable scheduling tool, such as the Primavera Project Planner where there are assigned start and end dates and owners. On complex programs, the scheduling tool needs to be able to produce multiple views of activities and milestones. For Project Managers it needs to conveniently list the outputs (e.g. deliverables or services) and the resources required to produce them. For Program Managers the tool needs to list the milestones each project team is responsible for, together with the associated deliverables.

There is considerable advantage to forming a connection between significant process outputs and milestones in time. Firstly, attaching deliverables to milestones removes any ambiguity regarding whether a milestone has been achieved. Second, it identifies major cross-team dependencies, which will have a major cross-team impact in the event of schedule slippage. Additionally, being at a higher level than tasks/activities, it is easier for Program Managers to conduct a meaningful review of progress without having to become involved in the inner workings of individual project teams.

Page 38, line 1-page 39, line 13 (emphasis added).

As stated in the passage set out above from the present application, milestones are outputs produced by one project team, and such milestones from the one project team are inputs to processes owned by other project teams. The language of the claim particularly points this out, thereby distinguishing the invention over the cited art. In accordance with this, claim 1 particularly points out that "selected sets of sequentially-linked ones of the processes are assigned to selected project teams." Further, "the sets are designated as respective process streams" and "milestones are designated for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams." This enables the benefit described at the end of the passage set out above, i.e., "it identifies major cross-team dependencies, which will have a major cross-team impact in the event of schedule slippage."

The rejection relies on teaching by Duncan about a design project having a series of phases from conceptual development through definition and implementation to closure. Duncan, page 13. The Final Office Action contends that this teaches "assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked processes to selected project teams," and that it teaches "the sets are designated as respective process streams," as claimed.

The rejection also relies on a passage in Gundewar, col. 5, lines 57-64, which the Final Office Action states teaches a method for automated project planning with entry and exit criteria that may include milestone, approval, procedure completions and/or design or

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

production events necessary to enter or exit the particular processes. The Final Office Action contends that the cited passage teaches “milestones are designated for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams,” as claimed in the present case.

Appellant first respectfully contends that the rejection is improper because it does not adequately identify the specific parts and explain the pertinence of the specific parts of each reference relied upon for rejection of each specific element or step. 37 CFR 1.104 (c) (2); MPEP 707 (requirement to set out specific parts of the reference relied upon for the rejection and an explanation of the pertinence of the specific parts). While Appellant gratefully acknowledges that the First Office Action and the Final Office Action do point out specific page or figure references relied upon for the rejections, Appellant respectfully contends this falls short of providing Appellant sufficient guidance to fully respond.

Specifically, it is not clear what particular thing in the cited passage of the reference is supposed to be like what particular part of the present claim. For example, is the Final Office Action equating Duncan’s “series of phases” to one set out of the claimed “sets of sequentially-linked processes”? What particular teaching on page 13 of Duncan does the Final Office Action equate to “selected project teams” in claim 1? And what particular act taught on page 13 of Duncan does the Final Office Action equate to the assigning of selected sets of sequentially-linked processes to selected project teams, as claimed in the present case? In the cited passage of Gundewar, if the Final Office Action equates Gundewar’s milestones to the claimed milestone in the present case, and equates Gundewar’s processes to the claimed process streams in the present case, then what does the Final Office Action equate to the “links spanning across two or more of the process streams” in claim 1 of the present case?

Secondly, Appellant respectfully contends that all the limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Duncan in view of Saito and Gundewar, and therefore the rejection is improper. MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)). Specifically, Appellant respectfully contends that the cited teachings of Duncan do not even suggest assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked processes to selected project teams, as claimed in the present case. And Appellant respectfully contends that the cited teachings of Gundewar

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

do not even suggest “milestones are designated for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams,” as claimed in the present case.

In addition to the above, Appellant wishes to point out that it is important to rely on objective evidence and make specific factual findings with respect to the motivation to combine references. MPEP 2143.01 (citing *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1342-44, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433-34 (Fed. Cir. 2002). “There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art.” MPEP 2143.01 (citing *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998)). Regarding the teachings of the prior art, the teachings must do more than merely show all aspects of the claimed invention were individually known in the art. MPEP 2143.01 (citing *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) and indicating there must be an *objective* reason to combine the teachings of the references). Regarding the nature of the problem to be solved, such motivation might exist in the nature of the problem to be solved if each reference is directed “to precisely the same problem.” MPEP 2143.01 (citing *In Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 357 F.3d 1270, at 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). Regarding the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art, it has been held that without a finding about a “specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of the skilled artisan” that would have provided a motivation to combine the teachings, alleged knowledge persons of ordinary skill in the art provided no motivation to combine. MPEP 2143.01 (citing *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, at 1370-1371, (Fed. Cir. 2000)).

Thirdly, Appellant contends the rejection is improper because the asserted motivation for the combination of Duncan and Gundewar is not proper. The Office action contends that one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the asserted teaching by Duncan, as described herein above, with the asserted teachings of Gundewar, as also described herein above, in order to provide a tracking tool for meeting criteria of the processes, citing Gundewar, col. 5, lines 60-64. It appears that the Office action contends the teaching of Gundewar itself provides a motivation to combine the references, since the Office action cites a passage from Gundewar. The Office action appears to be offering, as an objective reason

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

for the combination, that Gundewar teaches about a tracking tool for meeting criteria of the processes.

Even assuming, merely for the sake of argument, that Duncan teaches “assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked processes to selected project teams,” and “the sets are designated as respective process streams,” as claimed; and assuming, merely for the sake of argument, that Gundewar teaches “milestones are designated for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams,” as claimed; Appellant contends it does not follow that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by an observation in Gundewar about a tracking tool for meeting criteria of the processes to combine the two purported teachings. The Office action fails to explain how one follows from the other.

For all the above reasons, and particularly because the present invention, as claimed, advantageously provides a previously nonobvious system that enables identifying major cross-team dependencies, which would have a major cross-team impact in the event of schedule slippage, Appellant respectfully contends claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2, 4 and 5

Appellant respectfully contends that claims 2, 4 and 5 are allowable at least because they depend on claim 1. MPEP 2143.03 (“If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious,” citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Claims 6, 8 and 9. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 6, 8 and 9 stand or fall together.

Claim 6, Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, on grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Claim 6 also sets out a system having limitations regarding information technology and data structures, like claim 1. Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper for reasons set out above regarding claim 1.

Claim 6, Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 6 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge” by William R. Duncan (Duncan) in

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

view of U.S. Patent 6,381,610 (Gundewar). However, claim 6 has all the limitations of claim 1. Consequently, Appellant respectfully contends claim 6 is allowable for the reasons set out above regarding claim 1. Further, claim 6 is all the more allowable because it is more narrowly limited to a sporting event, and further includes a set of game-day processes.

Claims 8 and 9

Appellant respectfully contends that claims 8 and 9 are allowable at least because they depend on claim 6. MPEP 2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious," citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 stand or fall together.

Claim 10, Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, on grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statuatory matter. Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper.

A claim for a computer-related process is statutory if it results in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is disclosed. See MPEP 2106 IV B 2 (b) (discussing statutory processes and *Alappat*, 33 F.3d 1526, 1543 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (in banc). The inputs, outputs, links and exit conditions of claim 10 are not explicitly claimed as being *in* data that is *included* in the computer systems or telecommunications equipment, as is the case with claim 1, for example. But the method of claim 10 includes executing a build process, which includes building information technology. Since this means building a computer system or telecommunication equipment, or a combination thereof, including both hardware and software, the claimed step therefore requires putting together computer system or telecommunication hardware and developing software. Thus, claim 10 results in a physical transformation of computer system or telecommunications equipment that is being built, which occurs outside a computer system. "A claimed process is clearly statutory if it results in a physical transformation outside the computer . . ." MPEP 2106 IV B 2 (b) (immediately prior to discussing specific examples of

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

safe harbors in which such transformations occur). Accordingly, Appellant contends claim 10 is to a statutory process.

Claim 10, Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 10 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds as claim 1. Claim 10 sets out limitations that are like claim 1 insofar as the prior art rejections are concerned, except that claim 10 is for a method form of the invention, and except that the claimed inputs, outputs, links and exit conditions are not explicitly stated as being in data that is included in computer systems or telecommunications equipment. Aside from this structural aspect, the process limitations regarding inputs, outputs, links, exit conditions and their interrelation are as set out in claim 1. Appellant therefore respectfully contends the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper for reasons set out above regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 1, and that the invention of claim 10 is patentably distinct.

For all the above reasons, and particularly because the present invention, as claimed, advantageously provides a previously nonobvious process that enables identifying major cross-team dependencies, which would have a major cross-team impact in the event of schedule slippage, Appellant respectfully contends claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 11, 13 and 14

Appellant respectfully contends that claims 11, 13 and 14 are allowable at least because they depend on claim 10. MPEP 2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious," citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Claims 15, 16, 18 and 19. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 stand or fall together.

Claim 15, Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, on grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Claim 15 has limitations regarding information technology and data structures like those of claim 10. Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper for reasons set out above regarding claim 10.

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

Claim 15, Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 15 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds as claim 6. Claim 15 sets out limitations that are like claim 1 insofar as the prior art rejections are concerned, except for the following: i) claim 15 is for a method form of the invention, ii) the claimed inputs, outputs, links and exit conditions of claim 15 are not explicitly claimed as being in data that is included in computer systems or telecommunications equipment, and iii) claim 15 has an additional step regarding executing the program. Aside from the structural aspect of ii), the process limitations regarding inputs, outputs, links, exit conditions and their interrelation are as set out in claim 1. Appellant therefore respectfully contends the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper for reasons set out above regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 1, and that the invention of claim 15 is patentably distinct.

Claims 16, 18 and 19. Claims 16, 18 and 19 are allowable at least because they depend on claim 15. MPEP 2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious," citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Claim 21. Claim 21 stands or falls alone.

Claim 21, Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, on grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Claim 21 has limitations regarding information technology and data structures like those of claim 10. Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper for reasons set out above regarding claim 10.

Claim 21, Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 21 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds as claim 6. Claim 21 sets out limitations that are like claim 6 insofar as the prior art rejections are concerned, except for the following: i) claim 21 is for a method form of the invention, and ii) the inputs, outputs, links and exit conditions of claim 21 are not explicitly claimed as being in data that is included in computer systems or telecommunications equipment. Aside from this structural aspect of ii), the process limitations regarding inputs, outputs, links, exit conditions and their interrelation are as set out in claim 6. Appellant therefore respectfully contends the

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP920000171US1

rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper for reasons set out above regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 6, and that the invention of claim 21 is patentably distinct.

Claim 22 and 23. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 22 and 23 stand or fall together.

Claim 22, Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, on grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Claim 22 has limitations regarding information technology and data structures like those of claim 10. Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper for reasons set out above regarding claim 10.

Claim 22, Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 22 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds as claim 15. Claim 22 sets out limitations that are like claim 15 insofar as the prior art rejections are concerned, except claim 22 includes a step of determining program requirements. Appellant therefore respectfully contends the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper for reasons set out above regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 15, and that the invention of claim 21 is patentably distinct.

Claim 23. Claim 23 is allowable at least because it depends on claim 22. MPEP 2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious," citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Claims 24 and 25. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 24 and 25 stand or fall together.

Claim 24, Rejection Under 35 USC 101

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 101, on grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Claim 24 has limitations regarding information technology and data structures like those of claim 10. Appellant respectfully contends the rejection is improper for reasons set out above regarding claim 10.

Appl. No. 09/657,497
Filed 09/08/2000

Atty Docket JP92000017US1

Claim 24, Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 24 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the same grounds as claim 10. Claim 24 sets out limitations that are like claim 22 insofar as the prior art rejections are concerned, except that claim 24 has an additional step regarding executing the program and has additional limitations regarding iterative repeating of steps. Appellant therefore respectfully contends the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper for reasons set out above regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 22, and that the invention of claim 24 is patentably distinct.

Claim 25. Claim 25 is allowable at least because it depends on claim 22. MPEP 2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious," citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

REQUEST FOR ACTION

Based on the above arguments, Appellant requests that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 21-25 of the present application be allowed and the application promptly passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By Anthony V.S. England
Anthony V.S. England
Registration No. 35,129
Attorney of Record for
IBM Corporation
1717 West Sixth Street, Suite 230
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: 512-477-7165
a@aengland.com

Attachment: Claims Appendix

APPENDIX "AA" CLAIMS

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend the claims as set out below:

1. (previously presented) A system for a build and operate program, comprising:

information technology for the build and operate program, wherein the program includes:

- one or more build processes;
- one or more operate processes; and
- one or more management processes; and

wherein the information technology includes data representing i) inputs and outputs for ones of said processes and ii) a plurality of links associated with respective ones of the inputs and outputs, wherein the links provide connections linking outputs from ones of said build, operate and management processes to inputs of respective other ones of the build, operate or management processes;

wherein such a link has exit conditions associated with the link and the exit conditions for the link must be satisfied before the link can be traversed from output to input;

wherein selected sets of sequentially-linked ones of the processes are assigned to selected project teams and the sets are designated as respective process streams; and

wherein planning milestones are designated for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams.

2. (previously presented) The system of claim 1, wherein said build processes precede said operate processes, with an overlapping boundary therebetween, such that some operate processes are able to be executed before all build processes are executed.

3. (canceled)

4. (previously presented) The system of claim 3, wherein each management process is linked only to either a build process or an operate process.

Docket JP920000171US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,497

Filed: September 8, 2000

APPENDIX "AA" CLAIMS

5. (previously presented) The system of claim 1, wherein said exit conditions represent deliverable products or services that have been agreed to be provided.

6. (previously presented) A system for a large-scale sporting event, comprising:

information technology for the event, wherein the event includes:

a set of build processes generally followed by a set of testing processes, generally followed by a set of operations processes, generally followed by a set of game-day processes;

a set of management processes related to all of said build, testing, operations, and game-day sets of processes; and

wherein the information technology includes data representing i) inputs and outputs for ones of said processes and ii) a plurality of links, wherein the links provide connections linking outputs from ones of said build, test, operate, game-day, and management processes to inputs of respective other ones of the build, test, operate, game-day, and management processes;

wherein such a link has exit conditions associated with the link and the exit conditions for the link must be satisfied before the link can be traversed from output to input;

wherein sets of selected, sequentially-linked ones of the processes are assigned to selected project teams and the sets are designated as respective process streams; and

wherein planning milestones are designated for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams.

7. (canceled)

8. (previously presented) The system of claim 6, wherein each management process is linked only to either a build process or an operate process.

9. (previously presented) The system of claim 6, wherein said exit conditions represent deliverable products or service levels that have been agreed to be provided.

Docket JP920000171US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,497

APPENDIX "AA" CLAIMS

Filed: September 8, 2000

10. (previously presented) A method for establishing a build and operate program, wherein executing the program includes building and operating information technology, the method comprising the steps of:

defining one or more build processes, wherein executing such a build process includes building information technology;

defining one or more operate processes, wherein executing such an operate process includes operating information technology;

defining one or more management processes, wherein the build, operate and management processes have respective inputs and outputs;

forming a plurality of links associated with respective ones of the inputs and outputs, wherein the links provide connections linking the outputs from ones of said build, operate, and management processes to the inputs of respective other ones of the build, operate, or management processes;

associating exit conditions with the respective links, wherein the exit condition for a respective one of the links must be satisfied before the link can be traversed from output to input;

assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked ones of the processes to selected project teams and designating the sets as respective process streams; and

designating planning milestones for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams.

11. (original) The method of claim 10, wherein said build processes precede said operate processes, with an overlapping boundary therebetween such that some operate processes are able to be executed before all build processes are executed.

12. (canceled)

13. (previously presented) The method of claim 11, wherein each management process is linked only to either a build process or an operate process.

14. (original) The method of claim 10, wherein said exit conditions represent deliverable products or service levels that have been agreed to be provided.

Docket JP920000171US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,497

APPENDIX "AA" CLAIMS

Filed: September 8, 2000

15. (previously presented) A method for executing a build and operate program, wherein executing the program includes building and operating information technology, the method comprising the steps of:

defining one or more build processes, wherein executing such a build process includes building information technology;

defining one or more operate processes, wherein executing such an operate process includes operating information technology;

defining one or more management processes, wherein the build, operate and management processes have respective inputs and outputs;

forming a plurality of links, wherein the links provide connections linking outputs from ones of said build, operate, and management processes to inputs of respective other ones of the build, operate, or management processes, such a link being associated with at least one of the outputs and one of the inputs;

associating exit conditions with the respective links;

assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked ones of the processes to selected project teams and designating the sets as respective process streams; and

designating planning milestones for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams; and

executing the program, including traversing the links from their respective outputs to their respective inputs, wherein a respective one of the links is traversed only if the link's exit conditions are satisfied.

16. (previously presented) The method of claim 15, wherein said build processes precede said operate processes, with an overlapping boundary therebetween such that some operate processes are able to be executed before all build processes are executed.

17. (canceled)

18. (previously presented) The method of claim 16, wherein each management process is linked only to either a build process or an operate process.

APPENDIX "AA" CLAIMS

19. (original) The method of claim 15, wherein said exit conditions represent deliverable products or service levels that have been agreed to be provided.

20. (canceled)

21. (previously presented) A method for executing a large-scale sporting event, comprising the steps of:

defining a set of build processes generally followed by a set of testing processes, generally followed by a set of operations processes, generally followed by a set of game-day processes, wherein executing such a build process includes building information technology and executing such an operate process includes operating information technology;

defining a set of management processes related to all of said build, testing, operations, and game-day processes, wherein the build, testing, operations, management and game-day processes have respective inputs and outputs;

forming a plurality of links associated with respective ones of the inputs and outputs, wherein the links provide connections linking outputs from ones of said build, test, operate, game-day, and management processes to the inputs of respective other ones of the build, test, operate, game-day, and management processes; and

associating exit conditions with the respective links, wherein the exit condition for a respective one of the links must be satisfied before the link can be traversed from output to input;

assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked ones of the processes to selected project teams and designating the sets as respective process streams; and

designating planning milestones for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams.

22. (previously presented) A method for executing a build and operate program, comprising the steps of:

determining program requirements;

defining, responsive to said requirements, build, operate, and management processes, and related links therebetween, wherein the build, operate and management processes have respective inputs and outputs , wherein executing such a build process includes building

Docket JP920000171US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,497

APPENDIX "AA" CLAIMS

Filed: September 8, 2000

information technology and executing such an operate process includes operating information technology;

associating exit conditions with the respective links, wherein such a link between respective ones of processes is only traversable if exit conditions associated with the link are satisfied;

assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked ones of the processes to selected project teams and designating the sets as respective process streams; and

designating planning milestones for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams; and

executing the processes, including traversing said links over time.

23. (original) The method of claim 22, wherein said requirements include deliverable products and service levels.

24. (previously presented) A method for executing a build and operate program comprising the steps of:

a) determining program requirements;

b) defining, responsive to said requirements, build, operate, and management processes, and related links therebetween, wherein the build, operate and management processes have respective inputs and outputs, wherein executing such a build process includes building information technology and executing such a operate process includes operating information technology;

c) determining what requirements should be met to perform a certain one or more of the processes;

d) defining exit criteria for one or more of the processes immediately preceding the certain one or more processes for which requirements were determined in step c), wherein said exit criteria for such a processes must be satisfied before traversing any such link defined in step b) from the process to another one of the processes;

e) repeating steps c) and d), in a next iteration thereof, for one or more of the processes immediately preceding the one or more of the processes for which the requirements were determined in the previous iteration of step c), wherein an initial one of the iterations of step c) begins with an ultimate one of the operate processes;

Docket JP920000101US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,497

APPENDIX "AA" CLAIMS

Filed: September 8, 2000

assigning selected sets of sequentially-linked ones of the processes to selected project teams and designating the sets as respective process streams; and

designating planning milestones for ones of the outputs having links spanning across two or more of the process streams; and

f) executing the processes, including traversing said links over time.

25. (original) The method of claim 24, wherein said requirements include deliverable products and service levels.

26 - 28. (canceled)